

February 27, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H1817

needs and not to bargain away standards or educational opportunity.

If in the end there just is not the money to finance such opportunity—this becomes an issue for public decision through the legislature.

Surely the turning away of 3,500 students, otherwise qualified, does not represent faithful stewardship.

Surely the bargaining away of so basic a university standard as open-door opportunity makes a mockery of the state's master plan for higher education—which has as its first predication the determination to furnish a seat for all who can qualify.

SPY HYSTERIA

(Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. KAZEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BYRNE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Philadelphia Inquirer has put the Central Intelligence Agency-National Student Association affair into perspective in a recent editorial.

The actions of the CIA and the NSA appear to the writer and, I may add, to myself—as patriotic, not reprehensible.

These organizations were combating the effort by international communism to subvert student groups all over the world.

We were forced to fight fire with fire—and we did so successfully.

The Inquirer states the case in terms for Philadelphia—and the rest of the country—with this observation:

We happen to live in a jungle world, not in some Utopia where a country's intelligence service can operate in full view of the public at Broad and Chestnut Streets.

I include this fine editorial as a permanent part of the Record, as follows:

FALSE HYSTERIA

The outcry following disclosure that the Central Intelligence Agency had helped finance the National Student Association has been almost hysterically out of all proportion to the actual situation.

All kinds of sinister motives have been read into the CIA's connection with the student organization, with the implication that young people have been corrupted by Government subsidy and used as spies or in some other outlandish capacity.

Not surprisingly, critics of President Johnson, whether those opposed to him politically or those who take the left-wing line in any matter having to do with foreign policy, have seized upon the CIA-Student Association affair to make the President the target of new attack.

At the same time, America's Intelligence Service has been made to appear as though it were engaged in some nefarious conspiracy, with students as their tools.

On the part of those who support international Communism and who oppose U.S. foreign policy at all times, such tactics are understandable. But there is no sensible reason for others to join in this uproar. We happen to live in a jungle world, not in some Utopia where a country's intelligence service can operate in full view of the public at Broad and Chestnut streets.

A calm appraisal of the oversensationalized disclosure of the National Student Association subsidies will make the hullabaloo of the past week seem ridiculous.

After questioning CIA Director Richard Helms, a subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee issued a statement saying that the CIA aid was given, at the stu-

dent's request, to counter Communist attempts to take over foreign student organizations, by making it possible for American students holding independent views to participate in international meetings.

"It is no secret," the statement continued, "that since the end of the Second World War, the Communists concentrated on student organizations throughout the free world and by 1950 were successful to the point that they had little opposition. Patriotic and worried students in the U.S. were quick to recognize the situation. Leaders of their organization sought appropriate help. It was forthcoming, and has now served its purpose. Espionage was not involved: the survival of freedom was."

The intent of the CIA aid was patriotic; to help resist the inroads made by international Communism. What is the intent of those who are trying to defame and to belittle the CIA, and to embarrass the Government of the U.S. with their outcries over the student subsidy incident? Certainly they are giving aid and comfort only to our enemies.

CONGRESSMAN CLAUDE PEPPER INTRODUCES A BILL TO CHANGE THE OCCUPATIONAL DEFINITION FOR OLDER WORKERS UNDER SOCIAL SECURITY

(Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. KAZEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill which will help answer a question which has plagued us and our offices for years. It is probably the question most frequently asked about the social security disability program. The question is:

I have suffered a disabling injury which makes it impossible for me to continue to work. Why am I not entitled to disability benefits?

In answer to such a letter we have pointed out that the law requires that you must be disabled for any substantial gainful activity and that just because you cannot work at your previous occupation does not, as such, qualify you for benefits. We point out that the law is stricter than most staff retirement systems, such as civil service, which require that you only suffer a disability which prevents you from doing the work you previously did. Last year's Committee on Ways and Means report stated:

In line with the original views expressed by your committee and since reaffirmed, to be eligible an individual must demonstrate that he is not only unable, by reason of a physical or mental impairment, to perform the type of work he previously did, but that he is also unable, taking into account his age, education, and experience, to perform any other type of substantial gainful work, regardless of whether or not such work is available to him in the locality in which he lives.

I find it particularly difficult to explain this test to older workers. For most of them inability to work at their old jobs means inability to work at all. Vocational rehabilitation for them is much more difficult than for younger workers. Moreover, it seems to me a trifle harsh to impose a test that requires them to leave their homes of a lifetime to seek

"theoretical" employment in other parts of the country.

I think the Congress recognized the harshness of this provision last year when it adopted, in the conference committee, a provision that individuals aged 55 or over who are "blind"—as defined in the law—may qualify for cash benefits on the basis of their inability to engage in their past occupation or occupations.

The bill I introduce would merely extend this test to all persons age 55 or over, whether blind or not, so as to entitle them to benefits if their disability is such as to prevent them from engaging in substantial gainful activity requiring skills or abilities comparable to those of any gainful activity in which he has previously engaged with some regularity and over a substantial period of time.

The adoption of this "occupational" definition for our older workers will bring more realism and justice to the social security disability program. I urge the Committee on Ways and Means to study this legislation and present it to the Congress in the near future.

UNDERPAYMENT OF SOCIAL SECURITY BENEFITS

(Mr. PEPPER (at the request of Mr. KAZEN) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to introduce a bill which will remove a technicality in the social security law which is causing considerable hardship to a good many people. The Social Security Administration acknowledges that there has been an underpayment of benefits in some 67,000 cases but maintains that it cannot pay out this money to those who should rightfully receive it because of the provisions of existing law. In 1 week alone—January 7 to January 13 of last year—over 3,400 complaints were received by the Social Security Administration as to this provision. About 100 of them were from my State of Florida.

The situation in brief is this. The Social Security Administration in the past had been authorizing payments to surviving beneficiaries of the unpaid benefits of a deceased beneficiary. To do this they had been interpreting broadly the phrase in section 204(a) in the law which authorized such payments "whenever an error has been made." In the face of a number of court decisions, they concluded they could no longer make such payments to the eligible survivors—usually the widow—and that such payments had to be paid to a legal representative. The cost of obtaining underpayments through a legal representative in many jurisdictions exceeded the amount of the underpayments. More than half of the underpayments are under \$100 and about 35 percent of the cases involve amounts of \$50 or less.

No particular problem is involved where an estate is one that must be probated, but in case of small estates, in States with no small estate statutes, the